

REMARKS**Posture of the case and action by Applicant herein**

Claims 1-23 were originally filed. The present Office action of April 3, 2007, is a first Office action and includes rejections of all claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). In order to overcome the rejections and objections, Applicant herein responsively cancels claims 1-23 and submits new claims 24-44.

Prior Art Rejections

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nachenberg (US 6,021,510) in view of Nachenberg (US 5,765,030) and Glover (6,763,466).

Claims 2 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nachenberg, Nachenberg and Glover as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Albrecht (US 2001 10005889).

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nachenberg, Nachenberg and Glover as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Feigen (US 2002101 38554).

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nachenberg, Nachenberg, Glover, and Albrecht as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Arnold (US 5,440,723).

Claims 6-9 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Radatti (US 7,143,113) in view of Nachenberg (US 5,765,030).

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected on the same basis as claims 1-9.

Claims 12, 13, 17, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Radatti in view of Nachenberg.

Claims 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Radatti and Nachenberg, as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Hoefelmeyer (US 7,043,757).

Claims 18 and 23 stand rejected on the same basis as claims 12, 13, and 22.

Applicant respectfully submits that newly submitted, independent claims 24, 31, and 38 are patentably distinct. The claims indicate first hash values, derived from and representing a plurality of replicas of a resource, are computed and stored. Current hash values for the replicas

of the resource are computed. Further, independent claims 24, 31, and 38 go on to state that the current and first hash values are compared “in order to identify whether all the hash values match.” Still further, independent claims 24, 31, and 38 state that “responsive to the hash value comparison indicating at least one changed replica of the resource,” detecting “whether a vulnerability exists” includes “detecting whether the at least one changed replica is greater in number than a predetermined number.” The cited references do not teach or suggest this combination of features.

Finally, newly submitted, independent claims 24, 31, and 38 state that a message is presented to a user “indicating a vulnerability, wherein the presenting is responsive to the predetermined number being exceeded.” The cited references do not teach or suggest at least this claimed feature..

For at least these reasons, newly submitted, independent claims 24, 31, and 38 are patentably distinct. In addition, newly submitted, dependent claims 35-30, 32-37, and 39-44 are allowable at least because they depend on allowable dependent claims.

No new matter is added, since the original application provides support. Regarding claims 24, 31, and 38, see original published application, paragraphs 0048, 0051 (computing and storing first and current hash values for replicas of a resource and comparing hash values in order to identify whether all the hash values match); paragraphs 0095, 0097 (detecting whether a vulnerability exists responsive to the hash value comparison indicating at least one changed replica of the resource, wherein the detecting comprises detecting whether the at least one changed replica is greater in number than a predetermined number); paragraph 0095 (presenting a message to a user indicating a vulnerability); and paragraphs 097 (the presenting is responsive to the predetermined number being exceeded). Regarding claims 25, 32, and 39 see original claim 2. Regarding claims 26, 33, and 40 see original claim 3. Regarding claims 27, 34, and 41, see original published application, paragraph 97 (the vulnerability includes a vulnerability to a computer virus). Regarding claims 28, 35, and 42, see original published application, paragraph 98 (the vulnerability includes a vulnerability to computer hacking). Regarding claims 29, 36, and 43, see original published application, paragraph 91 (classifying as vulnerable the data processing systems storing the replicas, wherein the classifying is responsive to the predetermined number of changed replicas of the resource being exceeded). Regarding claims 30, 37, and 44, see

vulnerability-resolution instructions relevant to the vulnerability, and sending the selected instructions to each of the data processing systems storing one of the replicas).

PRIOR ART OF RECORD

Applicant has reviewed the prior art of record cited by but not relied upon by Examiner, and asserts that the invention is patentably distinct.

REQUESTED ACTION

For the reasons explained herein above, Applicant contends that the claims as amended herein are patentably distinct, and hereby requests that Examiner grant allowance and prompt passage of the application to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for IBM Corporation
Registration No. 35,129
512-477-7165
a@aengland.com